1 2 3	Laura Vartain Horn (SBN 258485) KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 555 California Street, Suite 2700 San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 439-1625 laura.vartain@kirkland.com	
5	Allison M. Brown (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 2005 Market Street, Suite 1000	
6	Philadelphia, PA 19103 Telephone: (215) 268-5000	
7	alli.brown@kirkland.com	
8	Jessica Davidson (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP	
9	601 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10022	
10	Telephone: (212) 446-4800 jessica.davidson@kirkland.com	
11	Attorneys for Defendants	
12	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC, And RASIER-CA, LLC [Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]	
13		
14		
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
17	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
18	IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB
19 20	PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT LITIGATION	
		DECLARATION OF DANIEL
	LITIGATION	CUMMINGS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES,
21	This Document Relates to:	CUMMINGS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC, RASIER-CA, LLC'S UNOPPOSED STATEMENT IN
21 22	LITIGATION	CUMMINGS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC, RASIER-CA, LLC'S UNOPPOSED STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
21 22 23	This Document Relates to:	CUMMINGS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC, RASIER-CA, LLC'S UNOPPOSED STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIALS SHOULD BE
21 22	This Document Relates to:	CUMMINGS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC, RASIER-CA, LLC'S UNOPPOSED STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIALS SHOULD BE SEALED [ECF NO. 4483]
21 22 23 24	This Document Relates to:	CUMMINGS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC, RASIER-CA, LLC'S UNOPPOSED STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIALS SHOULD BE
21 22 23 24 25	This Document Relates to:	CUMMINGS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC, RASIER-CA, LLC'S UNOPPOSED STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIALS SHOULD BE SEALED [ECF NO. 4483] Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer
21 22 23 24 25 26	This Document Relates to:	CUMMINGS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC, RASIER-CA, LLC'S UNOPPOSED STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIALS SHOULD BE SEALED [ECF NO. 4483] Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer

DECLARATION OF DANIEL CUMMINGS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIALS SHOULD BE SEALED [ECF NO. 4483]

Case No. 3:23-MD-3084-CRB

I am a partner at the law firm of Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP, attorneys of record for

"Statement in Support of Sealing").

1.

2 3 Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Rasier, LLC, and Rasier-CA, LLC, (collectively, "Uber"). I am a member in good standing of the Bars of the States of Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska. I know the 4 5 following facts to be true of my own knowledge, except those matters stated to be based on information and belief, and if called to testify, I could competently do so. I offer this Declaration in the above-6 7 captioned matter in support of Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Rasier, LLC, and Rasier-CA, 8 LLC's Statement in Support of Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another 9 Party's Materials Should Be Sealed, dated November 25, 2025, ECF 4483 ("Plaintiffs' Motion" and

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

- 2. I have reviewed the Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding S-RAD Scores ("Stipulation"), filed November 25, 2025, ECF 4482 and 4483-3.
- Defendants seek only a single limited redaction to the Stipulation. The redacted information consists of proprietary, confidential technical information, specifically the average S-RAD score for a particular region and time period. See ECF 4482 at 2, ¶ 2 ("The average S-RAD" score for daytime trips in CityID 26 (covering Phoenix, AZ and Tempe, AZ) over a 7-day period ending on June 28, 2024 was [REDACTED].")
- 4. The Stipulation is a stipulation of fact and, on information and belief, the redacted piece of information has no bearing on the public's ability to understand the merits of the litigation. Neither the Stipulation nor the redacted fact are related to a dispositive motion.
- 5. On information and belief, disclosing S-RAD scores would provide competitors insights and visibility into Uber's trade secrets, which even on a limited basis could allow competitors to begin to reverse engineer this highly confidential technology that Uber has not revealed publicly and has gone to great lengths to safeguard, causing competitive harm to Uber.
- 6. There is no public interest in the disclosure of the average S-RAD score for daytime trips in a portion of Arizona over a 7-day period ending on June 28, 2024. On information and belief, this minor detail adds nothing to the public's understanding of the merits of this litigation.

Page 3 of 3